

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Attached hereto is one (1) sheet of corrected drawings. The sheet is labeled
“Replacement Sheet” as required by 37 CFR 1.121(d). No new matter has been added.

REMARKS

Claims 28-30 and 32-56 are pending in the application following entry of the amendments herein. Claims 1-27 and 31 are canceled. Claims 28, 38, 42, 43, 49-51, 55 and 56 have been amended. The specification has been amended in the abstract to address an objection by the Examiner. The drawings have been amended in response to an objection by the Examiner. No new matter has been added.

ARGUMENTS

Claims 28-35 and 37-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,817,231 (Souza). Claim 28 recites a water purification apparatus having an inlet and an outlet, and at least one water purification means thereinbetween. The outlet includes at least a first water release means and a second water release means. The first and second water release means are respectively operable at first and second flow rates. Claim 28, as amended, recites that the first flow rate differs from the second flow rate.

Souza discloses a water purifying and vending machine including water dispensing means 28. The water dispensing means 28 includes a left bay flow path (152, 154, 156) and a right bay flow path (153, 155, 157). The water is discharged from the left and right bays of the dispensing means 28 through separate output nozzles (158, 159). Souza neither states nor implies that the water dispensing means 28 is adapted to provide variable flow rates such that *the first flow rate differs from the second flow rate* as required. Specifically, claim 28 requires that the first flow rate be different from the second flow rate. This requirement is not disclosed nor suggested by Souza.

For the foregoing reasons, Souza does not include each and every feature of claim 28 and, therefore, does not anticipate claim 28. Each of claims 29-35 and 37-50 depends from claim 28 and, therefore, is not anticipated by Souza for the same reasons as claim 28. Claim 35 further recites that at least one water release means is operable at a relatively slow flow rate and at least one other water release means is operable at a relatively fast flow rate. Claim 41 further recites that the water release means are operable automatically. Claims 42 and 43 further recite a control means for controlling

the outlet flow and flow rate through all of the water release means and that the control means is pre-programmed to calculate the rate of flow through each water release means.

Claim 50 further recites that the first and second water release means combine their flows prior to dispensing flow from the outlet.

Souza fails to disclose the additional features recited in these claims. Therefore, Souza fails to anticipate these claims for these additional reasons in addition to the above reasons for claim 28.

Claim 51 recites a method for method for dispensing water from a water purification apparatus having an inlet and an outlet, and at least one water purification means thereinbetween, the outlet including at least a first water release means and a second water release means. Similar to claim 28 above, claim 51 recites that the first and second water release means are operable at first and second flow rates that differ from each other.

Again, Souza fails to disclose or imply that the left and right bays of the dispensing means are adapted to dispense water at *first and second flow rates that differ from each other* as required by claim 51. Souza, therefore, fails to anticipate claim 51.

Each of claims 52-56 depends from claim 51 and, therefore, is not anticipated by Souza for the same reasons as claim 51. Claim 54 further recites that the first water release means has a relatively fast flow rate and that the second release means has a relatively slow flow rate. Claim 56 further recites that the flows from the first and second water release means is combined before the water is dispensed from the outlet. The additional features required by these claims are not disclosed or implied by Souza. Therefore, for these additional reasons, in addition to those above for claim 51, these claims are not anticipated by Souza.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 28-35 and 37-56 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based on Souza be withdrawn.

It is also respectfully submitted that claims 28-35 and 37-56 are not obvious over Souza. As discussed above, Souza neither states nor implies that the water dispensing means 28 is adapted to provide variable flow rates such that *the first flow rate differs from the second flow rate* as required by the independent claims. The claims recite a

device which requires that the first flow rate be different from the second flow rate. This requirement is not disclosed nor suggested by Souza. Furthermore, Souza only describes a release component for either manually dispensing (Col. 4, line 55) or alternatively, “continuously dispensing” (Col. 4, lines 56-57). These two alternatives imply that there is no imposed constraint on the two flow rates. There is also no control means disclosed as required by a number of the claims (see claim 53). Hence, it is respectfully submitted that claims 28-35 and 37-56 are patentable over Souza.

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Souza. Claim 36 depends from claim 28 above and further recites that the at least one water release means is operable at a relatively slow flow rate of up to 0.1 litres per minute and at least one water release means is operable at a relatively fast flow rate of up to 2 litres per minute.

Souza does not disclose or suggest that the left and rights bays are adapted to respectively dispense water at first and second flow rates that differ from each other as required by claim 36 and certainly does not disclose or suggest that one of the bays is operable to dispense water at a relatively slow rate of up to 0.1 litres per minute while the other of the flow bays is operable to dispense water at a relatively fast flow rate of up to 2 litres per minute in the manner required.

For the above reasons, Souza fails to provide the necessary teaching of claim 36 and, therefore, fails to render claim 36 unpatentable. The applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Souza be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that direct communication with Applicants' representative will expedite consideration of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE UNDERWOOD

BY:



ROBERT E. CANNUSCIO

Registration No. 36,469

Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP

One Logan Square

18th and Cherry Streets

Philadelphia, PA 19103-6996

Tel: 215-988-3303

Fax: 215-988-2757

Attorney for Applicant